

REMARKS

Claims 1-67 are all the claims pending in the present application. By amendment above, claim 55 has been amended.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-54 are allowed.

Claims 55-57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Each indicated occurrence of indefiniteness has been corrected by amendment above. In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 58-60 and 67 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Palalau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,472) ("Palalau"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicable case law holds that in order to anticipate a claim, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every feature of the claim. In the present case, Palalau does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 58 recites, *inter alia*, "logically dividing a plurality of *portions of the vehicle* into predetermined regions (emphasis added)." The Patent Office avers that this feature is disclosed at column 8, lines 25-28. *See, e.g.*, claim 1, lines 5-8. However, Palalau does not disclose, teach or suggest this limitation.

The logically dividing step is not recited at column 8, lines 25-28. This section of the Palalau patent merely describes a plurality of feature group switches supported on a steering wheel. The feature group switches include an audio group switch, a climate group switch, a navigation group switch, a cruise control switch, a cruise control off switch, and a configure switch. Column 3, lines 31-35 of Palalau. The feature group switches do not include regions indicative of a plurality of portions of a vehicle, as recited in claim 58.

Claim 58 further recites, *inter alia*, "*digitally controlling input/output data of the divided regions* according to a corresponding region (emphasis added)." Notwithstanding the Patent

In re Kim
Application No. 10/019,484
Amendment dated May 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2004

Office's assertion that Palalau discloses this feature at column 8, lines 31-32 (see, e.g., claim 1, lines 11-12), Applicant submits that Palalau does not disclose the claimed divided regions, and thus, Palalau cannot teach or suggest this feature. Further, "selection switches adjusting the values of said features associated with said activated feature group (e.g., pressing a switch - col. 5, lines 20-23)" is not "digitally controlling input/output data of the regions according to a corresponding region" (as recited in claim 58).


Claim 58 recites further, inter alia, "performing integrated control of the data of a corresponding region." The Patent Office relies on column 8, lines 37-38 of Palalau to teach this feature. See, e.g., claim 1, lines 17-18. This portion of Palalau simply describes a control circuitry for adjusting the value of an activated feature. Adjusting the value of a feature after selection of a switch (as performed in Palalau) is not "performing integrated control of the data of a corresponding region" (as recited in claim 58).

Since Palalau does not teach each and every limitation of independent claim 58, Palalau cannot anticipate this claim. Thus, the § 102(e) rejection of claim 58 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 59, 60 and 67 depend on independent claim 58 and are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 58.

Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Monica S. Davis

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 44,492

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.

Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

Telephone: (202) 783-6040

Facsimile: (202) 783-6031